



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,626	06/25/2003	Flora P. Goldthwaite	MFCP.101281	8980
45809 7590 12/03/2008 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. (c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613				
EXAMINER				
ABEDIN, SHANTO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2436				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/602,626

Applicant(s)

GOLDTHWAITE ET AL.

Examiner

SHANTO M. ABEDIN

Art Unit

2436

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 19-24 and 26-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 19-24 and 26-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the communication filed on 08/28/2008.
2. Claims 16, 19-24 and 26-45 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 16, 19-24 and 26-45 have been rejected.

Response to Arguments

4. The applicant's arguments regarding previous 35 USC 103(a) type rejections are fully considered, however, moot in view of new grounds of rejections presented in this office action.
5. The applicant's arguments regarding the previous 35 USC 101 type rejections of claims 26-31 are fully considered, however, found not persuasive. In particular, the amendments made to the claims 26-31 were unable to overcome the issues set forth by previous 35 USC 101 type rejections (please see below for detail explanations)

Claim Objections

6. Claims 16, 19-24 and 32-45 are objected because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 16, it recites the limitations "select known identities". However, there is no antecedent basis for the limitations "select known identities" in the claim, instead, claim languages previously recited "selected known identities". Therefore, "select known identities" should be written as "selected known identities", or should be corrected appropriately.

Regarding claim 21, it is dependent on claim 14. However, claim 14 is currently cancelled by the applicant. Therefore, appropriate corrections are required regarding the dependency of the claim.

Regarding claim 32, it recites the limitations “the method comprising;” which seem to have grammatical error – the applicant is suggested to replace the semicolon (;) with a colon (:), or correct it appropriately.

Regarding claim 35, it is missing a period (.) at the end of the claim limitations. The appropriate corrections are required.

Regarding claims 19-20, 22-24, 33-34 and 36-45, they are objected because of their dependencies on the objected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 32, it recites the limitations “wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the identity owner account, and wherein the

identity owner account utilizes the plurality of electronic devices....storing, in the identity owner account, the authorization of the userreceiving from the identity owner, and indication as to which of the plurality of the electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the conveyance of the communication from the user regardless of a communication mode....reference useable by the user to access the identity owner account in order to communicate with the identity owner, wherein accessing the identity owner account is the only way for the user to establish a communication..”. However, NOWHERE in the specification, or the originally filed claim set, and “identity owner account” for utilizing electronic devices, storing user authorization, or establishing a communication is found. Furthermore, it is not clear what the applicant is trying to claim by the limitations “electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the conveyance of the communication from the user regardless of a communication mode” – no such “conveyance of the communication from the user regardless of a communication mode” is described in the specification!

Therefore, the claim(s) contains subject matter (such as identity owner account utilizes the plurality of electronic devices....storing, in the identity owner account, the authorization of the user utilized in the conveyance of the communication from the user regardless of a communication mode....reference useable by the user to access the identity owner account in order to communicate with the identity owner, wherein accessing the identity owner account is the only way for the user to establish a communication) which were not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2436

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 26-31, they are directed to a system comprising plurality of the components, however, although preamble of the claim set recite “a system having a processor and memory”, the actual claim limitations failed to disclose any associated computer hardware/structures or devices, and it is not clear what is the exact nature of such ‘having’ – is memory and processor communicative to the claimed system, or associated with claimed system, or actually stored, or component of such system?

Claimed features such as a service, permission control, and preference control could optionally be implemented in software only. In particular, the specification discloses claimed features can be implemented as a part of the program modules or application program (please see par 0023).

Therefore, claims are rejected under 35 USC 101 because of being non-statutory. See MPEP 2106.01

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 16, 19, 21-24, 26-27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al (Pub US 2002/0149705 A1) in view of Balasuriya (US 2003/0041048 A1) further in view of Heatley (US 7164936 B2)

Regarding claim 16, Allen et al teaches method for facilitating electronic communications management by a system user, the method comprising:

wherein the unique reference is required for identities to access a unique identity belonging to the system user (Par 065, 093; a unique address, or caller ID/ telephone number associated with the contacts are needed to initiate the communication between the contacts and users).

permitting access to the unique identity belonging to the system user through a unique reference (Par 065, 093; accessing/ communicating to 'contact' through unique device address, or caller ID/ telephone number associated with the contacts), wherein the unique identity comprises a plurality of components (Par 093, 095, 096; contact including plurality of components such as identifiers and addresses);

allowing the system user to alter any one of the plurality of components without altering the reference (Par 092, 095, 100; user changing visual/ audio identifiers/ contacts without making any change to caller ID or the phone numbers associated with the identifier/ contacts) and

providing the system user with tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that selected known identities have access to selected component of the plurality of components, to accept electronic communication from selected known identities (Par 034, 043, 091-0092, 101; user having a hybrid communicator, or communication selection component, or user selection component for regulating access to the hybrid communicator/ controller, or other receiving devices to communicate with the selected contacts/ devices) wherein the unique reference is required to be used by the selected known identities to communicate with the selected components (Par 065, 093; a unique address, or caller ID/ telephone number associated with the contacts are needed to initiate the communication between the contacts and users); and

allowing the system user to select a communication delivery method for receiving communications from each of the select known identities (Par 091, 094, 104; selecting on of the communication methods)

Allen et al fails to teach expressly generating a unique reference for the system user; and wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user to accept electronic communication.

However, Balasuriya discloses generating a unique reference for the system user (Par 023, 028, 036, 037; deriving caller identity/ id based on phone number, IP address, or device information). Furthermore, it would have been obvious from Allen et al's teachings to a person of ordinary skill in art to further including the step of selected components of the plurality components are being authorized by the system user to accept electronic communication in order to provide users with authorized recipient devices other than hybrid

communicator (since each contact/ user has plurality of communication devices associated with each of them, and it would be desirable to use any of them to accept communication).

Furthermore, Heatley teaches generating a unique reference for the system user; and wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user to accept electronic communication (Fig 3; Col 5, starts at line 60; user profile is interpreted as user identity; user reference associated with the user identifier, and equipment id or delivery mode as component of the user profile/ identity).

Heatley, Balasuriya and Allen et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing communication. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to combine the teaching of Heatley or Balasuriya with Allen et al to design a method to further including the step of generating a unique reference for the system user in order to provide an alternative to caller id or device addresses.

Regarding claim 19, Allen et al teaches the method further comprising allowing the system user to select an additional communication delivery method for unknown system users (Par 091-094, 104; plurality of communication methods).

Regarding claim 21, Allen et al teaches the method further comprising allowing a sender to select a communication transmission mode (Par 063, 092-094; plurality of communication methods).

Regarding claim 22, Allen et al teaches the method further comprising allowing a first system user to select a communication transmission mode and allowing a second system user to select a communication delivery mode (Par 063, 094, 104; communication methods associated with different users). Furthermore, Heatley discloses the method further comprising allowing a first system user to select a communication transmission mode and allowing a second system user to select a communication delivery mode (Fig 3; Col 5, starts at line 60; delivery modes)

Regarding claim 23, Allen et al teaches the method further comprising translating the communication transmission mode into the communication delivery mode if required (Par 063, 094, 104). Furthermore, Heatley discloses translating the communication transmission mode into the communication delivery mode if required (Fig 3; Col 5, starts at line 55; message converting; delivery modes)

Regarding claim 24, Allen et al teaches the method further comprising providing video, audio, and text communication delivery modes and communication transmission modes (Par 063, 092, 094).

Regarding claim 26, Allen et al teaches a system for allowing a user having a unique identity to manage communications, wherein the unique identity is associated with a plurality of electronic devices, the system comprising:

a service, wherein an authorized identity can access the user's unique identity to communicate with the user only by using the unique reference (Par 065, 093; a unique address,

Art Unit: 2436

or caller ID/ telephone number associated with the contacts are needed to initiate the communication between the contacts and users);

permission controls for allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities which includes the authorized identity (Par 092- 094; user selecting/ controlling desirable communication devices/ addresses, and methods as a part of the creating contacts or identifiers); and

preference controls for allowing the user to select at least one associated device from a plurality of devices associated with the user, the at least one device is selected for receiving communication upon an access attempt by an authorized user (Par 034, 043, 092-094; user selecting/ controlling desirable devices/ addresses associated with the selected contacts).

Allen et al fails to disclose a service for generating a reference to a user's identity; and for assigning a reference to a user's unique identity such that the unique reference is a pointer to the user's unique identity.

However, Balasuriya discloses a service for generating a reference to a user's identity (par 023, 028, 036-037; deriving caller identity/ id based on phone number, IP address, or device information). Balasuriya further discloses allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities (par 023-028, 036-037; restricting/ permitting communication based upon subscriber/ user, and/ or device's status and identities). Furthermore, Heatley discloses a service for generating a reference to a user's identity; and for assigning a reference to a user's unique identity such that the unique reference is a pointer to the user's unique identity (Fig 3; Col 5, starts at line 60; references associated with user identifier/ profile). Heatley further discloses preference controls for allowing the user to select at least one associated device from a plurality of devices associated with the user, the at

Art Unit: 2436

least one device is selected for receiving communication upon an access attempt by an authorized user (Col 4, starts at line 55; user preferences)

Heatley, Balasuriya and Allen et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing communication. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to combine the teaching of Heatley and Balasuriya with Allen et al to design a method comprising allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities in order to prevent unauthorized user access.

Regarding claim 27, Allen et al teaches the system wherein the service is a centralized service comprising a directory for allowing system users to locate references for other system users (Par 064-065; list or directories of caller ID/ telephone number associated with the contacts).

Regarding claims 29 and 30, they are rejected applying as same motivation and rationale applied above rejecting claims 22, 24 and 26.

Regarding claim 31, Allen et al teaches the system wherein the plurality of associated devices comprise at least a telephone and a personal computerized device (Par 064-065, 094; plurality of communication devices).

10. Claims 32-45 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al (Pub US 2002/0149705 A1) in view of Burgess (US 6359970 B1) further in view of Heatley (US 7164936 B2)

Regarding claim 32, Allen et al discloses a method for managing electronic communications directed to an identity owner by way of an identity owner account, wherein the identity owner account is associated with a plurality of electronic devices of the identity owner, the method comprising;

receiving, from the identity owner, an indication of a user that is authorized to communicate with the identity owner; and wherein the plurality of electronic devices to facilitate the users' communication to the identity owner (Fig 6, Fig 7; Par 060, 063-066, 091-093, 101; communication selection component, or contact entry component allowing the users to select a set of 'contact' that users want to communicate with; contacts are associated with the specific devices/ addresses);

storing, the authorization of the user to communicate with the identity owner (Fig 6, Fig 7; Par 060, 063, 066, 093, 101; storing desired contact information);

receiving, from the identity owner, an indication as to which of the plurality of electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the conveyance of a communication from the user regardless of a communication mode utilized by the user to establish the communication (Par 0022, 0034, 0043, 0066, 0092; allowing users to select suitable/ desirable device to communicate with the contacts);

storing, the indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to convey a communication from the user (Fig 6, Fig 7; Par 060, 063, 066, 093, 101; storing desired contact/ communication device information); and

generating a unique reference that is the only reference useable by the user to access the identity owner in order to communicate with the identity owner; and wherein a communication from the user is routed to the identity owner according to the stored indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to convey a communication from the user (Par 065, 093; a unique address, or caller ID/ telephone number associated with the contacts are needed to initiate the communication between the contacts and users).

Allen et al fails to disclose expressly wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the identity owner account, and wherein the identity owner account utilizes the plurality of electronic devices to facilitate the users' communication to the identity owner; storing, in the identity owner account, the indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to convey a communication from the user; generating a unique reference that is the only reference useable by the user to access the identity owner account in order to communicate with the identity owner, wherein accessing the identity owner account is the only way for the user to establish a communication with the identity owner.

However, Burgess teaches storing, in the indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to convey a communication from the user; and the user to access the identity owner information in order to communicate with the identity owner (Col 7, starts at line 50; Col 12, starts at line 45; communication control; caller ID components)

Furthermore, Heatley teaches wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the identity owner account, and wherein the identity owner account utilizes the plurality of electronic devices to facilitate the users' communication to the identity owner (Fig 3; Col 4, starts at line 50; user account with HLR, home location register; user

Art Unit: 2436

preference, allowed equipments) ; storing, in the identity owner account, the indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to convey a communication from the user; generating a unique reference that is the only reference useable by the user to access the identity owner account in order to communicate with the identity owner, wherein accessing the identity owner account is the only way for the user to establish a communication with the identity owner (Fig 3; Col 4, starts at line 50; Col 5, starts at line 59; references; user preference, allowed equipments).

Burgess , Heatley and Allen et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing communication. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to combine the teaching of Burgess and/ or Heatley with Allen et al to design a method wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the identity owner account, and generating a unique reference that is the only reference useable by the user to access the identity owner account, and wherein accessing the identity owner account is the only way for the user to establish a communication with the identity owner in order to control users' communication preferences in an anonymous, and centralized manner.

Regarding claim 33, Allen et al discloses the method further comprising maintaining a look-up table for locating unique references at the request of a system user (Par 065; caller ID; telephone number). Furthermore, Burgess discloses the method further comprising maintaining a look-up table for locating unique references at the request of a system user (Col 8, starts at line 30; lookup table).

Regarding claim 34, Allen et al discloses the method further comprising providing preference controls for allowing an identity owner to select default methods for receiving communications from the user (Fig 5; Par 066, 091-093; contact containing communication device information/ address; selecting contacts and associated device addresses).

Regarding claim 35, Allen et al discloses the method wherein the receiving an indication as to which of the plurality of electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the conveyance of a communication from the user includes an indication for two or more electronic devices (Par 022, 034, 043, 066, 092; allowing users to select suitable/ desirable device to communicate with the contacts). Furthermore, Heatley discloses the method wherein the receiving an indication as to which of the plurality of electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the conveyance of a communication from the user includes an indication for two or more electronic devices (Col 4, starts at line 50; Col 5, starts at line 59; user preference, allowed equipments)

Regarding claim 36, Allen et al discloses the method comprises allowing the identity owner to select a live communication delivery method (Par 093-094, 104; interactive television/ videoconferencing; address associated with the interactive television/ videoconferencing system). Furthermore, Heatley discloses allowing the identity owner to select a live communication delivery method (Col 4, starts at line 50; Col 5, starts at line 59; user preference; delivery mode selection)

Regarding claim 37, Allen et al discloses the method wherein the method comprises allowing the identity owner to select a message communication delivery method (Par 063, 092-

Art Unit: 2436

094; plurality of types of reception devices/ addresses associated with the plurality of the communication methods/ systems).

Regarding claim 39, Allen et al discloses the method wherein the method comprises allowing selection of a live communication delivery method for a first group of users and a message communication delivery method for a second group of users (Par 063, 092-094; plurality of types of reception devices/ addressess associated with the plurality of the communication methods/ systems such as e-mail, text messaging, or interactive television/ videoconferencing).

Regarding claim 40, Burgess discloses the method further comprises allowing the identity owner to block communication delivery from a third group of individuals (Col 7, line 25 to Col 9, line 67; setting priority data; blocking)

Regarding claim 41, Allen et al discloses the method further comprising providing the identity owner with a pointer as the associated reference (Par 065; caller ID associated with the contacts). Furthermore, Heatley discloses the method further comprising providing the identity owner with a pointer as the associated reference (Fig 3; Col 6, starts at line 5; reference to the user/ identifier)

Regarding claim 42, Allen et al discloses the pointer to reference a plurality of electronic devices accessible to the identity owner (Par 065; caller ID associated with the contacts; Par 091-093; contact containing communication device information/ address)

Regarding claim 43, Allen et al discloses the method further comprising allowing transmission of a communication from the user in a first mode and delivery of the communication to the identity owner in a second mode (Par 063, 092-094; plurality of types of reception devices/ addresses associated with the plurality of the communication methods/ systems such as e-mail, text messaging, or interactive television/ videoconferencing).

Regarding claim 44, Allen et al discloses the method further comprising translating the communication from the first mode to the second mode (Par 094; device configured to convert/ reproduce the messages). Furthermore, Heatley discloses translating the communication from the first mode to the second mode (Col 5, starts at line 60; message conversion)

Regarding claim 45, Allen et al discloses the method wherein the first mode and the second mode comprise one of voice communications, text communications, and video communications modes (Par 063, 092-094; plurality of types of reception devices/ addresses associated with the plurality of the communication methods/ systems such as e-mail, text messaging, or interactive television/ videoconferencing).

11. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al (Pub US 2002/0149705 A1) in view of Burgess (US 6359970 B1) further in view of Heatley (US 7164936 B2) further in view of Boman et al (US 6895257 B2).

Regarding claim 38, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 34, combination of Burgess- Heatley-Allen et al fails to teach expressly allowing a message sender to control a sent

message until a receiver processes the message, such that a sender may delete a sent message prior to processing.

However, Boman et al discloses allowing a message sender to control a sent message until a receiver processes the message, such that a sender may delete a sent message prior to processing (abstract; editing before sending/ processing email).

Boman et al and Allen et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of personalized communication control devices. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Boman et al with Burgess- Heatley -Allen et al to design the method further comprising the step of allowing a message sender to control a sent message until a receiver processes the message, such that a sender may delete a sent message prior to processing in order to provide user with the editing facilities such as error correcting or updating or deleting before the message is actually sent (Boman et al, abstract).

12. Claims 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al (Pub US 2002/0149705 A1) in view of Balasuriya (US 2003/ 0041048 A1) further in view of Heatley (US 7164936 B2) further in view of Burgess (US 6359970 B1)

Regarding claims 20 and 28, they are rejected applying as above applied rejecting claims 16 and 26, Furthermore, Allen et al discloses providing live and message communication delivery options, and the permission controls further comprise tools for restricting a communication delivery method to one of live, message (Par 063, 092-094; plurality of types of reception devices/ addresses associated with the plurality of the communication methods/ systems). Furthermore, Heatley discloses the permission controls further comprise tools for

restricting a communication delivery method to one of live, message (Col 4, starts at line 50; Col 5, starts at line 59; user preference; delivery mode selection).

Modified Heatley- Balasuriya- Allen method fails to disclose blocked communication delivery options, or blocking communication delivery from system user.

However, Burgess discloses the method/ system further comprises blocked communication delivery options, or blocking communication delivery from system user (Col 7, line 25 to Col 9, line 67; setting priority data; blocking).

Burgess and Allen et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing communication. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to combine the teaching of Burgess with modified Heatley- Balasuriya- Allen et al method/ system to design a mechanism comprising blocked communication delivery options, or blocking communication delivery from system user in order to provide user with the options of unauthorized call blocking.

Conclusion

13. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. Finally, for any

Art Unit: 2436

future amendments to claims, the applicant is respectfully requested to incorporate the paragraph numbers from the specification upon which the support for such amendments were obtained.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanto M Z Abedin whose telephone number is 571-272-3551. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:30 AM to 7:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Moazzami Nasser, can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. The RightFax number for faxing directly to the examiner is 571-273-3551.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2436

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shanto M Z Abedin

Examiner, AU 2436

/Carl Colin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436

12/1/2008

